

**2002-06, 2003-02**

I graduated from a non-ABA law school in Nashville TN; due to my elderly parent's illness, I was unable to stay in Tennessee to take the Bar Exam there and had to return to St. Paul, Minnesota to be their primary caregiver. I am currently enrolled in the International Law LLM program in Hamlin University school of Law. I will complete this program in December of 2004 and intend to sit for the Bar Exam in Michigan shortly thereafter and move to the Lansing area where my family has some farmland.

I oppose the proposed change in rule 2[a], which will prevent me from appearing in the Michigan Bar Exam. I am not aware of the reasons that compel the Michigan Board of Bar Examiners to prevent persons such as myself from seeking a chance, an opportunity, to prove their competence as attorneys. Applicants such as myself have gone to great lengths to educate ourselves to avail this opportunity to sit for the bar, only to be told that this LLM avenue might be shut off, for reasons known best only to the Bar Examiners.

I can only speculate that the ABA is behind this proposal in it's, by now, a losing quest to maintain its chokehold on legal education and Bar admissions in the United States.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out the following facts to this Court:

In 1995, The United States Attorney General's antitrust division had filed action in the United States District Court in the District of Columbia [civil action No. 95-1211 (CRR)] against the ABA, alleging inter alia, violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act and sought equitable, injunctive and other relief. A consent decree and a settlement were reached and a Final Judgment was entered, wherein the ABA was forbidden and enjoined from certain conduct.

Specifically, a highly summarized version of Section IV reads: First, it prohibits the ABA from salary fixing of the faculty and boycott of Non-ABA schools. Second the ABA may not prevent ABA-accredited law schools from accepting transfer credits from state-accredited, but not ABA-accredited, laws schools. Third, the ABA may not bar the ABA-accredited schools from accepting into their LLM programs graduates of such state-accredited schools. Fourth, the ABA may not deny accreditation because a school is organized as a for-profit entity.

As this Court can see, the ABA after consenting to such limitations continues to seek quashing any venues left for non-ABA graduates from

seeking Bar Admissions.

This aggressive push to limit non-ABA and foreign attorney's who will go to the extra effort of obtaining an ABA approved LLM is counterintuitive, harmful and contrary to principles of equity and fair play.

This rule change, if enacted will lend credence to the old adage; an emperor's lie is believed first before a peasant's truth can be verified.

I respectfully implore this Court to reject this proposal, for adopting the same will ensconce into permanence, the inequity and injustice inflicted on persons such as myself who have relied on this Michigan rule.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anita Johnson